



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,510	03/26/2004	Fan Ho	24295/81401	1180
37803	7590	06/30/2008		
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 555 CALIFORNIA STREET SUITE 2000 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104-1715			EXAMINER ANDUJAR, LEONARDO	
			ART UNIT 2826	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/30/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/810,510

**Applicant(s)**

HO, FAN

**Examiner**

Leonardo Andujar

**Art Unit**

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1448 or PTO-600) Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kledzik (US 5,266,912) in view of Wenzel et al (US 5,635,767).
3. Regarding claim 1, Kledzik (e.g. figs. 1-3) A multi-chip module (MCM) comprising: a first integrated circuit (IC) chip 13 on a substrate 17/51; a first ground plane 33 coupled to the first IC chip; a second IC chip 17 on the substrate 17/52; and a second ground plane 21/33 coupled to the second IC chip. Kledzik does not disclose that the first ground plane is physically separated and electrically isolated from the second ground plane. However, Wenzel discloses that a first and second ground planes physically and electrically separated (claim 9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to isolate the first and second planes of Kledzik as suggested by Wenzel to avoid noise and cross coupling.
4. Regarding claim 2, Kledzik shows that the first and second ground planes is coupled to at least one external lead 27 of the MCM.
5. Regarding claim 3, Kledzik shows that the at the first and second ground planes is formed as respective trace on the substrate.

6. Regarding claim 4, Kledzik shows that the at the first and second ground planes is substantially rigid (col. 2/lis. 36-59). Note that substrate retains it shape at normal condition.
7. Regarding claim 5, Kledzik shows that the at the first and second ground planes is substantially flexible (col. 2/lis. 36-59). Note that the layer comprises a cu layers formed on a polyimide layer. This type of structure can be considered flexible since both of the layers exhibit some degree of flexibility.
8. Regarding claim 6, Kledzik shows that the first and second planes are comprise a strip of conductive material (col. 2/lis. 36-59).
9. Regarding claim 7, Kledzik shows that the first and second planes are comprise a layer of conductive material (col. 2/lis. 36-59).
10. Regarding claim 8, Kledzik shows that the first and second planes comprise a substantially solid layer of conductive material (col. 2/lis. 36-59).
11. Regarding claim 9, Kledzik teaches that the first and second ground planes comprise a grid of conductive material. Note that the ground plane is part of a ping grid array.
12. Regarding claims 10 and 11, Kledzik shows that the first chip is bonded/attached to the first ground plane, and the second chip is bonded/attached to the second ground plane. Note that the chips are connected to the upper layers that are bonded/attached to the ground planes.
13. Regarding claims 12 and 14, Kledzik shows that the first and second chips comprise DRAMS (col. 1/lis. 15-27).

14. Regarding claim 15, Kledzik shows that the first and second chips are application specific integrated circuits (e.g. ROM, SRAM, DRAM; col. 1/lls. 15-27).
15. Regarding claim 16, Kledzik shows one of the first and second chips is coupled to a plurality of input/output connectors 27 of the MCM and the other of the first and second chips is not coupled to any input/output connectors of the MCM. In this case, the chips of the package 53 can be recognized as the second chip.
16. Regarding claim 17, Kledzik shows that the first chip is coped to the second chip via at least one trace 43.
17. Regarding claims 18 and 19, Kledzik shows that at least one of the first and second chips may be tested without affecting operation of the other of the first and second chips in the MCM. Note that packages are independent units. Therefore, they can be independently tested.
18. Regarding claim 20, Kledzik first power plane coupled to the first IC chip; and a second power plane couple to the second IC chip (col. 7/lls. 15-25).
19. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kledzik (US 5,266,912) in view of Wenzel et al (US 5,635,767) further in view of Wolf.
20. Kledzik in view of Wenzel shows most aspects of the instant invention including chips attached to the first and second ground planes. However, Kledzik in view of Wenzel does not disclose that solder balls (flip chip technique) can be used as connection means. Nonetheless, the use of solder balls as connection means is considered an obvious design choice and it is not patentable unless unobvious or unexpected results are obtained from these changes. It appears that these changes

produce no functional differences and therefore would have been obvious. Note *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. For example, the advantages of flip chip bonding (solder ball or C4) are: 1) the entire chip surface can be covered with solder bumps. In other words, bonding locations are not limited to the chip perimeter, thus more I/O capability is provided than by a perimeter interconnections on a die with the same size, and 2) the very short lengths of the chip to package interconnection paths minimizes their inductance (see Wolf pages 857-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use solder balls to make the electrical connections of the device disclosed by Kledzik in view of Wenzel in order to provide more I/O capability and to minimize the inductance as taught Wolf.

Comment [L1]: Print Wolf  
reference from 09975630

### ***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
22. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
23. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was

within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case, the use of ground plane to reduce cross talk is within the general knowledge of one having ordinary skills in the art (see teaching reference 20030009873, pp 0029).

### ***Conclusion***

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonardo Andújar whose telephone number is 571-272-1912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon through Thu from 9:00 AM to 7:30 PM EST.

Art Unit: 2826

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Purvis can be reached on 571-272-1236. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leonardo Andújar/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2826

Leonardo Andújar  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2826

12/07/2007